

13 May 1985

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Automation Risk Assessment

1. The development risk of the Automation design is the text processing part of the Classified System. Not surprisingly a review of this area of the Automation proposals resulted in a number of questions. It was decided to submit these questions formally to the contractors with answers to be presented at Headquarters beginning 8 May. In anticipation of these contractors sessions I requested a meeting with the Government evaluation team and the technical support contractor advisors--CRW and GE. This meeting was held on 7 May.

2. The technical proposals for the text processing part of the Classified System can be summarized as follows:

- a. Eaton - Hardware/Software
- b. Ultra - Hardware/Software
- c. LEC - Software only
- d. ESL - Software only (including GFE SAFE)

Each proposal represents obvious risks. The purpose of the 7 May meeting was to assess the degree to which the evaluation team understood the design and to review the questions presented to the contractors. In addition I was interested in how the evaluation team viewed relative risk prior to the contractor meetings.

3. The 7 May meeting focused on LEC and ESL designs. This was at my request. In passing, Eaton and Ultra designs were characterized as having some significant risk associated with the untried hardware part of the design. Separately, I have experience with the ORACLE OBMS and am aware of some of its performance limitations. The LEC design was considered risky because of an all new software approach. This was contrasted to the ESL use of SAFE which has proven capability. However, the ESL proposal does not identify the modules of SAFE to be used, the ease of separating them from the larger SAFE program, nor the ease of integrating them into the FBIS architecture. As such the ESL use of SAFE has its own associated risk.

SUBJECT: Automation Risk Assessment

4. The 7 May discussion was dominated by CRW and GE in answering my questions. Risks were quickly identified and I soon became satisfied that the questions to be asked were appropriate. However, I did not come away from the meeting with a clear sense of relative risk. Both CRW and GE stated that they had to reserve judgment pending the upcoming contractor meetings.



Deputy Director  
Foreign Broadcast Information Service

STAT